



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/664,734	09/18/2003	Brian Jones	60001.0274US01/MS # 30420	4716
7590 04/30/2008				
Leonard J. Hope, Esq. Merchant & Gould P.C. P.O. Box 2903 Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903				
EXAMINER				
BASEHOAR, ADAM L				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2178				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
04/30/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/664,734

Applicant(s)

JONES ET AL.

Examiner

ADAM L. BASEHOAR

Art Unit

2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 February 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 7, 8 and 10-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 19-22 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 7-8, and 10-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB-08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: The Amendment filed 10/29/07.
2. Claims 5-6 and 9 have been cancelled as necessitated by Amendment.
3. The rejection of claims 10, 17, 18, 21, and 22 under 35 U.S.C. 101 has been withdrawn as necessitated by Amendment.
4. The rejection of claims 6 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, has been withdrawn as necessitated by Amendment.
5. Claims 1-4, 7-8, and 10-22 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 12, and 19, are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

7. Claims 1, 7, 10, and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Piersol et al (US-5,745,910 04/28/98).

-In regard to independent claim 1 and dependent claims 10 and 11, Piersol teaches a method for restricting the application of formatting to the electronic document, comprising:

receiving a request to perform a formatting operation on a portion of the contents of the document (column 18, lines 31-67; column 19, 1-31: “a user can retrieve an entire document to view it and edit the individual parts as desired”), the formatting operation comprising importing

new content into the electronic document (column 17, lines 62-67; column 18, lines 1-31: “contents moved from one document to another”)(Fig. 14);

determining whether the requested formatting operation was permitted (column 18, lines 31-67; column 19, 1-31: “individual parts can be protected with limited access rights...access restrictability is another characteristic property of a part...other properties of a restricted part are still available to the users of the system”), wherein determining whether the requested operation was permitted comprises determining whether the new content contains one or more styles that are not permitted to be applied to the contents of the electronic document (column 17, lines 62-67; column 18, lines 1-31: “determines whether they belong to the same category...styled text and the destination is plain text”)(Fig. 14); and

in response to determining the operation was not permitted (column 18, lines 31-67; column 19, 1-31: i.e. the requesting user does not have the access rights as determined by the part), denying the request to perform the formatting operation (column 19: lines 10-14); and

replacing the styles contained in the new content that are not permitted with a permitted style prior to importing the new content (column 17, lines 62-67; column 18, lines 1-31: “the system converts the selected information into the same type as the destination document”)(Fig. 14: 1405: “convert to same type” & 1403: “incorporate new contents”).

-In regard to dependent claim 7, Piersol teaches wherein the permitted style was user selectable (column 17, lines 62-67; column 18, lines 1-31: i.e. the permitted style was user selectable in that the user created document’s intrinsic style was user selectable which correlated to the permitted style).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 12, 17, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over (US-5,745,910 04/28/98) in view of Broman et al (US-2003/0004957 02/02/03) in further view of Fein et al (US-6,088,711 07/11/00).

-In regard to independent claim 12 and dependent claims 17 and 18, Piersol teaches a method for limiting formatting to the contents of document, comprising:

receiving a request to apply formatting to contents of the document (column 18, lines 31-67; column 19, 1-31: “a user can retrieve an entire document to view it and edit the individual parts as desired”) and wherein the document could include permitted or acceptable styles (column 17, lines 62-67; column 18, lines 1-31)(Fig. 14).

Piersol does not specifically teach replacing styles contained in the electronic document that may not be applied with a style that may be applied in response to determining that styles that many not be applied should be removed. Broman et al replacing styles that exist in a target document (Paragraph 62: “determination is made that a corresponding style exists in the target document”)(Fig. 6: 607) that may not be applied with a style that may be applied (Paragraph 63: “the corresponding style is set equal to the source document style....the style of the selected text”)(Fig. 6: 618) in response to determining that styles that may not be applied should be removed (Paragraphs 59 & 61-63: i.e. based on the determination that the formatting operation

contains selected text which includes an associated style that corresponds to styles in the electronic document)(Fig. 6: 602, 604, 606, 608). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for Piersol to have been able to remove part type styles in a electronic document and replaced them with a usable style from the selected part type (column 17, lines 62-67; column 18, lines 1-31)(Fig. 14) as taught in Broman et al, because Broman et al taught that by replacing styles in an electronic document from a selected style, the user would be able to more easily reduce inconsistencies in formatting styles that may exist between source and target documents by redefining/reconciling the styles in the target document (Paragraph 7: "reduces inconsistencies in formatting styles").

Piersol also does not specifically teach determining whether the request comprises a request to apply formatting directly to the contents of the electronic document or a request to apply a style to the contents of the electronic document; in response to determining that the request comprises a request to apply formatting directly to the contents of the electronic document, denying the request; in response to determining that the request comprises a request to apply a style to the contents of the electronic document, determining whether the style may be applied to the document; and applying the style if the style may be applied to the document. Fein teaches wherein a user could edit a document via direct formatting (column 1, lines 63-67; column 2, lines 1-16: "using direct formatting"). Fein further teaches wherein a user could edit a document via the application of user selected styles (column 1, lines 15-62; column 2, lines 17-32: "a style is a set of named formatting properties"). Fein further teaches establishing a preference between direct and style based formatting (column 1, lines 43-67; column 2, lines 1-48) and applying style based formatting (column 1, lines 43-67; column 2, lines 1-48). It would

have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for Piersol to have determined the formatting request between direct and style, and to deny the formatting if it constituted direct formatting and to accept and apply the formatting if it constituted a permitted style formatting, because Fein taught that direct formatting was tedious and time consuming (column 2, lines 1-16: "direct formatting...tedious and time-consuming") and that the application of style formatting provided well known advantages (column 1, lines 54-67; column 2, lines 1-17: "advantages of styles are well known").

10. Claims 2 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Piersol et al (US-5,745,910 04/28/98) in view of Fein et al (US-6,088,711 07/11/00).

-In regard to dependent claim 2, Piersol teaches restricting the access for editing a document part based on limited access (column 18, lines 31-67; column 19, 1-31).

Piersol does not specifically teach wherein requested editing operation comprises a direct formatting operation and wherein determining whether the formatting operation was permitted comprises determining whether direct formatting of the contents of the electronic document was permitted. Fein teaches wherein a user could edit a document via direct formatting (column 1, lines 63-67; column 2, lines 1-16: "using direct formatting"). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for the user of Piersol to have been restricted from editing a document part based on direct formatting as taught in Fein, because Fein teaches that direct formatting was tedious and time consuming (column 2, lines 1-16: "direct formatting...tedious and time-consuming") compared to the advantages of applying formatting through styles (column 1, lines 54-62).

-In regard to dependent claim 8, Piersol comprises determining whether editing operations are permitted to modify the formatting of a part of a document based on access rights (column 18, lines 31-67; column 19, 1-31).

Piersol does not specifically teach wherein the editing operation was a programmatic operation that would result in the modification of the formatting of a portion of the electronic document and wherein determining whether the requested formatting was permitted based on the programmatic operation. Fein teaches wherein a user could edit a document via the programmatic application of user selected style or style sheet (column 1, lines 15-62; column 2, lines 17-32: “a style is a set of named formatting properties....all of the chapter titles....style would reflect the redefined style”). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for the user of Piersol to have allowed editing to a document part based on the application of a programmatic style formatting operation as taught in Fein, because Fein teaches that the application of style formatting provided well known advantages (column 1, lines 54-67; column 2, lines 1-17: “advantages of styles are well known”).

11. Claims 3 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Piersol et al (US-5,745,910 04/28/98) in view of Fein et al (US-6,088,711 07/11/00) in further view of Young (01/23/01 6,177,933).

-In regard to dependent claim 3, Piersol and Fein do not specifically teach displaying an error message indicating that direct formatting of the contents of the document was not permitted. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention for the restricted editing access of Piersol to have displayed an error when a user attempted to edit a document part without proper access rights, because displayed error messages were notoriously well known in the art at the time of the invention to provide the benefit of quickly informing a user to the context of denied request. Thus the user of Piersol in view of Fein would have been provided the benefit of knowing that direct formatting document editing was prohibited within the selected documents.

Neither Piersol nor Fein teach displaying a list of available styles in response to determining that the direct formatting of the contents was not permitted. Young teaches providing a user a list of available paragraph styles for user selection (column 3, lines 22-41; column 4, lines 13-23: “user can select another style from the scrolling list”)(Fig. 2C: 212: “Apply Changes”) to be applied to a document lexical element (column 1, lines 21-27). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for the user of Piersol to have been presented with a display of available styles as taught in Young, because Young teaches that a list of styles provides a convenient interface for a user to view and select a plurality of styles to be applied to a lexical document element (column 1, lines 21-27; column 4, lines 14-23: “user can select another style from the scrolling list”). Fein further teaches that displaying the list of styles in Young would provide Piersol the benefit of allowing the user to select style formatting to utilize their well known advantages (column 1, lines 54-67; column 2, lines 1-17: “advantages of styles are well known”).

-In regard to dependent claim 4, Young teaches receiving a selection of a style from the list of available styles and applying the selected style to a selected portion of the document

(column 1, lines 21-27; column 4, lines 14-23: “user can select another style from the scrolling list”).

12. Claims 13-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Piersol et al (US-5,745,910 04/28/98) in view of Broman et al (US-2003/0004957 02/02/03) in view of Fein et al (US-6,088,711 07/11/00) in further view of Young (01/23/01 6,177,933).

-In regard to dependent claim 13, neither Piersol nor Fein teach in response to determining that the request comprises a request to apply formatting directly to the contents of the electronic document: displaying a list of styles available to be applied in the document; receiving a selection of a style from the list; and applying the selected style to the document.

Young teaches providing a user a list of available paragraph styles for user selection (column 3, lines 22-41; column 4, lines 13-23: “user can select another style from the scrolling list”)(Fig. 2C: 212: “Apply Changes”) to be applied to a document lexical element (column 1, lines 21-27). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for the user of Piersol to have been presented with a display of available styles as taught in Young, because Young teaches that a list of styles provides a convenient interface for a user to view and select a plurality of styles to be applied to a lexical document element (column 1, lines 21-27; column 4, lines 14-23: “user can select another style from the scrolling list”). Fein further teaches that displaying the list of styles in Young would provide Piersol the benefit of allowing the user to select style formatting to utilize their well known advantages over direct formatting (column 1, lines 54-67; column 2, lines 1-17: “advantages of styles are well known”).

-In regard to dependent claim 14, Piersol teaches denying a request to edit a document part based on limited access rights (column 18, lines 31-67; column 19, 1-31: “a user can retrieve an entire document to view it and edit the individual parts as desired”).

Piersol does not specifically teach receiving a request to create a new style. Both Fein and Young teach receiving a request to create a new style (Fein: column 1, lines 29-34: “user can also define styles”)(Fig. 2B: “Create and store newly defined style”)(Young: Fig. 2A-2C: “New Style”). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for Piersol to have allowed the creation of new styles, because Fein teaches that by creating new styles a user could define a reusable style that could utilize the well known style advantages (column 1, lines 54-67; column 2, lines 1-17: “advantages of styles are well known”). Thus the users with complete access rights of Piersol would be provided the benefit of enforcing the new style to all the parts of the document. It also would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for Piersol to have blocked the creation of new styles, because Piersol teaches that some parts of the document have limited rights access (column 18, lines 31-67; column 19, 1-31: “a user can retrieve an entire document to view it and edit the individual parts as desired”) for editing, and thus the users of Piersol with limited access rights wouldn’t be able to change the intrinsic contents with said newly created style.

-In regard to dependent claim 15, Piersol teaches denying a request to edit a document part based on limited access rights (column 18, lines 31-67; column 19, 1-31: “a user can retrieve an entire document to view it and edit the individual parts as desired”).

Piersol does not specifically teach receiving a request to modify a style; and denying the request to modify a style. Both Fein and Young teach modifying a style (Fein: column 2, lines 1-32: “redefine the ‘chapter title’ style”)(Young: Fig. 2A: “Update Style”). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for Piersol to have allowed the modification of styles, because Fein teaches that by modifying styles a user could define a reusable style that could utilize the well known style advantages (column 1, lines 54-67; column 2, lines 1-17: “advantages of styles are well known”). Thus the users with complete access rights of Piersol would be provided the benefit of enforcing the modified style to all the parts of the document. It also would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for Piersol to have blocked the modification of styles, because Piersol teaches that some parts of the document have limited rights access (column 18, lines 31-67; column 19, 1-31: “a user can retrieve an entire document to view it and edit the individual parts as desired”) for editing, and thus the users of Piersol with limited access rights wouldn’t be able to change the intrinsic contents with said modified style.

-In regard to dependent claim 16, Piersol teaches importing new content into the electronic document (column 17, lines 62-67; column 18, lines 1-31: “contents moved from one document to another...user has selected an object and dragged it to its intended destination”), wherein determining whether the requested operation was permitted comprises determining whether the new content contains one or more styles that are not permitted to be applied to the contents (column 17, lines 62-67; column 18, lines 1-31: “determines whether they belong to the same category...styled text and the destination is plain text”), and further comprises replacing

the styles contained in the new content that are not permitted with a permitted style prior to importing the new content (column 17, lines 62-67; column 18, lines 1-31: “the system converts the selected information into the same type as the destination document”).

Allowable Subject Matter

13. Claims 19-22 are allowed.

Response to Arguments

14. Applicant's arguments filed 10/29/07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

-In regard to independent claim 1, Applicant argues that Piersol does not teach or suggest the newly added feature for, “determining whether the requested formatting operation was permitted, wherein determining whether the formatting operation was permitted comprises determining whether the new content contains at least one style that is not permitted to be applied to the contents of the electronic document.” The Examiner respectfully disagrees with the Applicant. As shown above in the rejection, Piersol clearly teaches wherein the formatting operation could comprise importing new content into the electronic document (column 17, lines 62-67; column 18, lines 1-31: “contents moved from one document to another”)(Fig. 14). Piersol further teaches determining whether the requested operation was permitted comprises determining whether the new content contains one or more styles that are not permitted to be applied to the contents of the electronic document (column 17, lines 62-67; column 18, lines 1-31: “determines whether they belong to the same category...styled text and the destination is

plain text”)(Fig. 14). Piersol, in Fig. 14, shows that if the formatting operation was permitted then the style of the imported part content was the same as the destination document part type (i.e. both plain text or both styled text) and the content was incorporated in the electronic document. If however the style of the selected part type was not the same as the destination, the style was not permitted and the style was converted to a permitted type before the contents were incorporated into the contents of the electronic document (column 17, lines 62-67; column 18, lines 1-31: “the system converts the selected information into the same type as the destination document”).

-In regard to independent claim 12, Applicant argues that neither Piersol nor Fein tech or suggest the newly added feature of, “replacing styles contained in the electronic document that may not be applied with a style that may be applied in response to determining that styles that many not be applied should be removed.” The Examiner agrees with the Applicant that neither Piersol nor Fein teach said features. However, as shown above in the new rejection, the Examiner believes said features would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention in view of the newly cited Broman et al reference.

Conclusion

15. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

16. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Adam L. Baschoar whose telephone number is (571)-272-4121. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F: 7:00am - 4:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Steve Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Adam L Basehoar/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2178